



National Commission on the Future of the Army
2530 Crystal Drive, Zachary Taylor Building, Suite 5000
Arlington, VA 22202

SUBJECT: National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Minutes from the Drafting Subcommittee Meeting

Date: 15 July 2015

Time: 0800-0900

Location: 2530 Crystal Drive, Zachary Taylor Building, Room 5137, Crystal City VA 22202

Attendees:

Commissioner Carter F. Ham, Drafting Subcommittee Chairman
Commissioner Thomas R. Lamont, Drafting Subcommittee Member
Commissioner Jack C. Stultz, Drafting Subcommittee Member
Commissioner HON Kathleen H. Hicks, Drafting Subcommittee Member
MG (Ret) Ray Carpenter – NCFA Staff Executive Director
Mr. Donald Tison – Designated Federal Official (DFO)
Mr. Ricky Smith – NCFA Staff Director
Mr. Eric Minton– NCFA Staff, Editor
COL William Story – NCFA Writer/Historian
Mr. Anthony Boyda – NCFA Staff
MAJ Benjamin Fernandez – NCFA Staff

Documents Submitted to Commission: Staff's Working Draft Outline for the NCFA Final Report.

Meeting Summary

General Ham opened the meeting by stating the purpose was to approve a working draft outline for the report to be presented at the Commission's 16 July public meeting. He noted the outline would probably evolve as the Commission continued its work leading to the final report. Mr. Tison, DFO, discussed the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and its applicability to this subcommittee meeting.

The Chairman turned the meeting over to Mr. Minton, who explained his background and role as managing editor for the final report and copy editor for the Commission and offered insights into the writing and production of the report. He cited benchmark reports, including the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force (NCSAF), of which he was editor, and the *Columbia* disaster investigation report, which influenced the NCSAF report in tone and structure. Congress, the President, and the Department of Defense and Department of the Army are the key audiences for the NCFA report, but Mr. Minton suggested the writers should keep in mind the media and the public as target audiences, too. He advised that while the report should be policy-based with concise facts and statistics, it should also be a compelling story using a variety of visuals. Mr. Minton concluded with a targeted timeline of the production process: the NCFA

subcommittees would submit their reports to the full Commission in October, the Drafting Subcommittee would write the draft of the final report in October/November, and the full Commission would finalize the report in November/December, allowing for copy editing, layout, and DoD security review in December and printing in January to meet the 1 February 2016 deadline. Ancillary material—appendices, sidebars, text boxes—can be compiled and finalized on an ongoing basis.

General Ham noted that while the report should speak to the merits and scope of the Army, the overarching narrative should not be as a cheerleader for the Army Headquarters. The report is an opportunity to educate Congress and the public, and the NCFA can champion Soldiers but not necessarily champion programs. Getting the right tone is crucial. Commissioner Stultz emphasized that the report should also educate the public about what the Army does for the Nation in creating leaders by training and educating young people. The subcommittee members expressed interest in using ancillary textual material throughout the report, such as sidebars and quotes, along with photography.

The subcommittee reviewed and revised a draft outline for the report. General Ham emphasized that the report needed to begin by explaining why the nation has an army, and that would incorporate a threat estimate. The next portion would address the Commission's mission and how the Commission did its work, including meetings, site visits, and research. The subcommittee members determined that such information would establish the credibility and transparency of the Commission's work. Commissioner Hicks stressed the need for the report to establish a risk framework within which it would address the levers for managing the Army. The remainder of the draft outline follows the analysis and recommendation requirements set out for the Commission in its Congressional charter.

Mr. Lamont raised the issue of the report dealing with contradictory information or statements from witnesses. Mr. Smith noted some witnesses had provided inaccurate information and the staff would ensure that the commissioners get accurate information. The report need only ensure accuracy of data and otherwise rely on the commissioners' expertise, for which they were nominated to serve on the Commission. A mechanism for allowing alternative views among Commissioners would also be incorporated into the final report.

The subcommittee instructed Mr. Minton to incorporate its revisions into a new working draft outline to be submitted to the full Commission at the 16 July public meeting.